

REMARKS

Claims 15, 16 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Duda (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,877.)

Claim 15 recites "incrementing a read pointer of the memory device each time a data word is read from the memory device; aligning the data words read from the memory device to a system bus; and adjusting the read pointer at the end of the fly-by read operation."

The Examiner indicates that Duda teaches these steps at Col. 13, lines 24-31. However, the cited portion of Duda states:

The next two bits, bits 20 and 21, are a source address increment (SINC) bit and a destination address increment (DINC) bit, respectively. These bits control whether the source and/or destination address pointers respectively are incremented after each data transfer. If one of these bits is a 1, incrementing does not occur and, for example if the SINC bit is set, the same data is transmitted over and over for the channel. (Duda, Col. 13, lines 24-31.)

The above-cited section of Duda, which teaches that source and/or destination address pointers may or may not be incremented after each data transfer, depending on the status of the SINC and DINC bits, teaches away from "incrementing a read pointer of the memory device each time a data word is read from the memory device" as recited by Claim 15.

Moreover, the above-cited section of Duda does not teach or suggest "aligning the data words read from the memory device to a system bus" as recited by Claim 15.

Finally, no portion of the above-cited section suggests "adjusting the read pointer at the end of the fly-by read operation" as recited by Claim 15. In fact, the description

of the SINC and DINC bits suggests that any adjustments to the source and/or destination address pointers must be made during each data transfer.

For these reasons, Claim 15 is not anticipated by Duda. Claims 16 and 23, which depend from Claim 15, are not anticipated by Duda for at least the same reasons as Claim 15.

Claims 1-14 and 24-36 have been allowed.

Claims 17-22 have been objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that these Claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, because Applicants believe that the base Claim 15 is allowable for reasons cited above, Applicants are not amending Claims 17-22 at this time.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-36 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



E. Eric Hoffman
Reg. No. 38,186
Attorney for Applicants
BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP

Customer No.: 027158
Tel. No.: (925) 895-3545
Fax No.: (925) 371-8187

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 10, 2004

9-10-04 
Date Signature: Carrie Reddick